

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Upon entry of the present Amendment, Claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 15, 18, 20, 21, and 22 will have been amended and claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, and 23 cancelled. By the present Amendment and Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that that the rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the March 2, 2007 Office Action and allowance of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Pending Claims

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 14, 15, 18-22 are pending in the application. Of these claims, Claims 1, 12, 18, and 20 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Summary of the Official Office Action

Summary of the Rejections

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-14 and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bisbee et al. (US Patent No. 7,162,635). [hereinafter referred to as "Bisbee"]

Claims 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisbee in view of Ginter et al. [US Patent No. 5,982,891) [hereinafter referred to as "Ginter"]

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 22 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Per the Office Action's recommendation, as indicated in the present Amendment, claim 22 has been amended so that the computer program is embodied in a computer-readable media.

In lieu of the present Amendment, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection for claim 22 be withdrawn and the claim be allowed at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-14 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bisbee.

Turning to the specific claim language of the present application, amended independent claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus for processing original data created by a predetermined author, the apparatus comprising inputting means for inputting the original data and original-data assuring information for assuring that the original data is an original, modification means for generating modification information to be able to modify the original data, storing means for storing the modification information, modification-assuring-information creating means for creating modification-assuring information for assuring that the modification information is true, and outputting means for outputting the original data, the original-data assuring information, the modification information, and the modification-assuring-information.

The present invention describes an apparatus that allows for modification of an image, such as changing brightness for easier visibility of an image or filtering, while assuring originality of original data. More specifically, includes the features of generating modification information for modifying original data, creating modification-assuring information to assure that the modification information is true, and outputting the original data, original data assuring information, the modification information, and the modification-assuring information.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bisbee fails to discuss or disclose at least the above-noted features of the present invention.

Bisbee is seen to describe a method and system that provides a verifiable chain of evidence and/or security associated with the transfer and retrieval of documents and other information stored digital formats. More specifically, Bisbee is seen to achieve this goal by appending to a digital document the digital signature and certificate of the document submitter, a time stamp when a Trusted Custodial Utility (TCU) assumes control of the digital document, and a digital signature and certificate of the TCU. In other words, all Bisbee is seen to disclose is appending, to a digital document, digital signatures and certificates of the document submitter and a TCU that assumes control of the document. The time stamp is seen to be merely time information and is not seen to include any modification information as described by the present invention.

Nothing in Bisbee is seen to teach or suggest at least the foregoing features of the present invention of generating modification information for modifying original data, creating modification-assuring information to assure that the modification information is

true, and outputting the original data, original data assuring information, the modification information, and the modification-assuring information.

Because Bisbee lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant submits that Bisbee fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended claim 1.

Amended independent claim 18 was rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. As such, the argument set forth above with respect to claim 1 is applicable to claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits that Bisbee fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended independent claim 18.

Turning to the specific claim language of the present application, amended independent claim 12 is directed to an information processing apparatus for processing original data created by a predetermined author, the apparatus comprising inputting means for inputting the original data, original-data assuring information for assuring that the original data is an original, modification information to be able to modify the original data, and modification-assuring-information for assuring that the modification information is true, original-data verifying means for verifying, by the original-data assuring information, that the original data is assured as being an original, modification-information verifying means for verifying, by the modification-assuring information, that modification information regarding a modification of the original data is assured as being true, and modifying means for modifying the original data in accordance with the modification information when it is verified that the original data is assured as being an original and the modification information is assured as being true.

Applicant respectfully submits that Bisbee is fails to discuss or disclose at least the above-noted features of the present invention. More specifically, Bisbee is not seen to

discuss or disclose at least the present invention's feature of verifying that the modification information regarding a modification of the original data is assured as being true.

According to the Office Action, column 16, lines 51-53 of Bisbee describe that modification information of the original data and the digital signature are assured as being true.

Column 6 lines 25-55 of Bisbee are seen to describe that the invention of Bisbee provides for re-validating a digital document by verifying the digital document's TCU digital signature using a public key extracted from the TCU certificate. Upon verification, the TCU's digital signature from the time the digital document was previously digitally signed remains valid, the digital document is re-validated, and the current date-time stamp, a digital signature newly computed by the TCU, and the TCU's current certificate are appended to the re-validated digital document.

In other words, Bisbee provides for verifying, using the TCU's digital signature, that the digital document and the digital signature and certificate of the document submitter existed when the date-time stamp is appended. In addition, Bisbee also provides for verifying whether the digital document was tampered with.

Thus, there is nothing in column 6, lines 25-55, or any other part of Bisbee, which is seen, even remotely, to teach or suggest at least the present invention's feature of verifying that the modification information regarding a modification of the original data is assured as being true.

Because Bisbee lacks at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant submits that Bisbee fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended claim 12.

Amended independent claim 20 was rejected for the essentially the same reasons as claim 12. As such, the argument set forth above with respect to claim 12 is applicable to claim 20. Therefore, Applicant submits that Bisbee fails to disclose each and every feature recited in amended claim 20.

Claims 2, 5-9, 14, 19, 21-22 depend from at least one of claims 1, 8, 12, or 20. As such, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least for the reason that they depend from one of allowable base claims 1, 8, 12, or 20 and recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 14, 18-22 and indicate that these claims are allowable over the art of record.

Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 15-17 as being unpatentable over Bisbee in view of Ginter.

In lieu of the present Amendment, claim 15 has been amended to depend from allowable base claim 1.

In lieu of the present Amendment, claims 16 and 17 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejection associated with these claims is not moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 15-17 and indicate claim 15 as allowed at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of such claims as the Examiner's earliest convenience.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 14, 15, 18-22. The applied references have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein is respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached at (949) 932-3329. All correspondences should be directed to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,
/ Sivon Kalminov/
Attorney for Applicants
Sivon Kalminov
Registration No. 40, 042

CANON U.S.A., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA. 92618
Facsimile: (949) 932-3560